

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. In an office action dated July 14, 2004, all claims were rejected. Applicants traverse the rejections as follows:

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Storch et al. (US Patent No. 5,920,846). As to claims 1 and 7, it was alleged that Storch teaches all of the elements of Applicants' claims, including "determining that the first personnel of the first organization are not available to provide the services requested by the requestor, providing a second organization having second personnel which are capable of performing the services requested by the requestor, determining that second personnel of the second organization can perform the services requested by the requestor, and assigning the services requested by the requestor to the second personnel, among others. Applicants do not believe that Storch teaches these features.

Applicants claim the feature of "determining that the first personnel of the first organization are not available to provide the services requested by the requestor". It was alleged that Storch teaches this feature in col. 17, line 61 through col. 18, line 32 in Storch. However, Applicants believe that this section simply describes the assignment of work to technicians employed by the "service provider", i.e., a telephone company. There is no teaching that a determination is made that a technician is unavailable to perform the work. This section describes the assignment of work to an "outside technician" based on a pool of technicians available to perform work for the service provider. An outside technician is selected from the pool of candidates based on factors such as each technician's qualifications, geographical location, etc.

Further, Applicants claim the feature of "providing a second organization having second personnel which are capable of performing the services requested by the requestor." It was alleged that Storch also teaches this feature in col. 17, line 61 through col. 18, line 32. However, Applicants believe that Storch teaches no such thing. Again, this section describes how a request for services is processed within a single service provider, i.e. telephone company, and how such a request is assigned to technicians who work for the service provider. Storch refers to these technicians as "outside technicians", however Applicants believe that the term "outside" simply refers to employee technicians who must travel to job sites in order to complete various service requests. Throughout the specification, Storch refers to "inside and outside telecommunication

facilities and equipment", for example, in col. 11, lines 64-66. Applicants therefore believe that the term "outside technician" refers to telephone company employees who perform work outside of the main facility, for example, traveling to job sites to complete work orders. In addition, there is no teaching in Storch that these "outside technicians" are associated with an entity other than the telephone company. Applicants, therefore, do not believe that Storch teaches "providing a second organization having second personnel which are capable of performing the services requested by the requestor." Applicants believe that only one organization, a telephone company, is described by Storch.

As to other features of claims 1 and 7, such as "determining that second personnel of the second organization can perform the services requested by the requestor, and assigning the services requested by the requestor to the second personnel", Applicants do not believe that these features are taught either. The term "second personnel" or a "second organization" are not taught by Storch because the "outside technicians" described in Storch refer to telephone company employees. Therefore, the steps of "determining" and "assigning" to a "second personnel", as claimed by Applicants, are likewise not taught.

As to claims 2, 3, 8, and 9, Applicants believe these claims are allowable as being dependent upon claims which Applicants believe to be allowable, namely claims 1 and 7, as explained above.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4-6 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Storch. It was alleged that Storch teaches all of the features of these claims, with the exception of teaching satellite or terrestrial-based networks, and that Official Notice was taken that these technologies are well known in the art.

Applicants believe that these claims are allowable as being dependent upon claims which Applicants believe to be allowable, namely claims 1 and 7, as explained above.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any

reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1-19-05

By:


Thomas M. Thibault
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 42,181

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-2356
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502